DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 360 116 RC 019 207

AUTHOR Sosa, Alicia
TITLE Thorough and Fair: Creating Routes to Success for Mexican-American Students.
INSTITUTION ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools, Charleston, WV.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO ISBN-1-880785-10-2
PUB DATE Mar 93
CONTRACT RI88062016
NOTE 69p.
AVAILABLE FROM ERIC/CRESS, P.O. Box 1348, Charleston WV 25325 ($10).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses - ERIC Clearinghouse Products (071) -- Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Bilingual Education; Child Advocacy; Cultural Differences; *Educational Strategies; Elementary Secondary Education; English (Second Language); *Equal Education; *Limited English Speaking; *Mexican American Education; Mexican Americans; Native Language Instruction; Role of Education
IDENTIFIERS *Hispanic American Students; *Language Minorities

ABSTRACT

This monograph describes implications for public schools of rapidly growing populations of Mexican-Americans and other language minorities and recommends ways to eliminate institutional barriers to equity and excellence in education. It presents current information about such issues as dropout rates, reading levels, and participation in advanced mathematics and science courses. It includes a synthesis of research about current trends, including the growth of this population, changes in immigration patterns, and changes in the segregation of this population. Chapter 1 describes Mexican-Americans and other language-minority groups in terms of levels of educational attainment, cultural and language diversity, and population trends and projections. Chapters 2-4 address personal, instructional, and school factors important for the success of language-minority students and examine trends and issues in bilingual education. Chapter 5 discusses ways to create school systems that support instruction of language-minority students including: (1) knowing student rights; (2) imparting high expectations; (3) ensuring appropriate student placement; (4) working to reduce the achievement gap; (5) taking an advocacy position in testing and grade retention; (6) improving staff development and minority teacher recruitment; and (7) involving parents in meaningful activities. Chapter 6 covers policy recommendations that include disaggregating student data, demonstrating commitment to uphold civil-rights laws, pursuing excellence and equity (not simply compliance), identifying a top-level administrator as an equity advocate, and joining the equity network. Desegregation assistance centers and other organizations providing information about educational equity are listed. Contains 99 references. (LP)

ED360116

Alicia Sosa

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

# Thorough and Fair

## Creating Routes to Success for Mexican-American Students

RC019207

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

2

# Thorough and Fair

# Thorough and Fair:

## Creating Routes to Success for Mexican-American Students

by
Alicia Sosa

ERIC®
Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools

ERIC

Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools
Appalachia Educational Laboratory
P.O. Box 1348
Charleston, WV 25325

Published March 1993.
Printed in the United States of America
Reproduction of portions of this document is permitted provided the ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools is credited as the source.

ISBN 1-880785-10-2

This publication was prepared with funding from the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, under contract no. RI-88-062016. The opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the positions or policies of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement or the Department of Education.

## Table of Contents


Executive Summary ..... vii

I. Mexican-Americans and Other Language-Minority Groups ..... 1
- Educational Attainment Levels ..... 2
- Diversity Among LEP Students ..... 3
- Trends and Projections ..... 4

II. Personal Factors Important for Success of Language-Minority Students ..... 7
- Academic Success ..... 8
- Social Interactions ..... 8

III. Instructional Factors Important for Success of Language-Minority Students ..... 11
- Current Achievement in Bilingual Education ..... 11
- Trends in Bilingual Education ..... 13
- Issues Related to Instruction ..... 19
- Summary ..... 20

IV. School Factors Important for Success of Language-Minority Students ..... 21
- Educators' Roles Redefined ..... 22
- Successful Schools ..... 23

V. Creating School Systems That Support Instruction of Language-Minority Students ..... 27
- Know the Rights of Language-Minority Students ..... 27
- Impart High Expectations ..... 28
- Ensure Appropriate Student Placement ..... 30
- Work to Reduce the Achievement Gap ..... 32
- Take an Advocacy Position in Testing and Grade Retention ..... 35
- Improve Staff Development and Minority Teacher Recruitment ..... 36
- Involve Parents in Meaningful Activities ..... 38
- Summary ..... 39

VI. Meeting the Challenges for the 1990s:
Policy Recommendations ..... 41
Recommendations ..... 43

References ..... 53
About the Author ..... 63

## Executive Summary

This monograph describes the implications for public schools of the following major Hispanic and Mexican-American population trends:

- Mexican-American students comprise the largest subgroup of Hispanics.

- Hispanics represent the largest segment of language minority populations in the United States. Hispanics account for 40 percent of the total LEP population and 64 percent of the school-aged population from a non-English language background (Jenger and Sandhu, 1985).

- Within the Vietnamese- and Spanish-speaking groups approximately three out of four persons, 75 percent, are considered limited-English-proficient (LEP) (Oxford-Carpenter, 1984).

- Hispanics are the fastest growing ethnic group in the nation. From 1980 to 1989 they experienced a population growth of 39 percent, five times that of the nation as a whole.

- At the school building level, students who attend urban schools with high percentages of minority students are at high risk of dropping out (Pallas, 1991).

As a group, Mexican-American students enrolled in U.S. public schools have not fared well. Current statistics indicate a disproportionately high attrition rate for this group of students. Nationally, the dropout rate for Mexican-Americans stands at 40 percent (Valdivieso & Davis, 1988), compared with 35.8 percent for Hispanics, 14.9 percent for Blacks, and 12.7 percent for Whites (Black, 1989).

Even more disheartening is the finding that over 53 *percent* of the

Hispanic students who drop out do so before completing the eighth grade (Cárdenas, Robledo and Supik, 1986). What is not surprising is the link between lack of academic success and leaving school. Researchers note that "one of the most often noted reasons for the high dropout rate in American schools is the lack of an appropriate match between the academic program of the school and the skills and interests of students" (Epstein & MacIver, 1990).

This monograph describes the educational attainment levels of Mexican-Americans. It presents current information about such issues as dropout rates, reading levels, and participation in advanced mathematics and science courses. It includes a synthesis of research about current trends, including the growth of this population, changes in immigration patterns, and changes in the segregation of this population.

The monograph treats these trends and issues from the perspective that providing bilingual services to Mexican-American students is a necessary but incomplete response to their needs. It also examines the role educators can play in overcoming institutional barriers to equity and excellence. Such barriers include, among others, the following: (1) misuse of certain forms of tracking and ability grouping; (2) shortcomings in policies that govern assessment and the use of assessment results, including its use for identification and placement in special programs for exceptional students (handicapped and gifted); and (3) the tendency to overlook the special needs of women and minorities in mathematics and science programs.

CHAPTER I

# Mexican-Americans and Other Language-Minority Groups

Mexican-Americans comprise the largest subgroup of Hispanics. Mexican-Americans number 12.1 million, and make up 62.3 percent of the Hispanic population (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1988). Although Mexican-Americans have settled in communities across the United States, the largest concentrations can be found in California and Texas, where 74 percent of Mexican-Americans resided in 1980. Another nine percent resided in Illinois and Arizona (Bean & Tienda, 1987).

The Mexican-American student population is diverse. Students may be immigrants themselves or the sons and daughters of immigrants. Or they may be the second, third, or tenth generation born in the United States with ancestors born when the land was either an independent republic or under Spanish or Mexican rule.

The family backgrounds and reasons for leaving their native Mexico have varied over time, as well. Some immigrants left Mexico for political reasons during the early 1900s at the time of the Mexican Revolution. In many cases, these immigrants had been well connected and politically involved, and left professional careers and high social position. Other immigrants left Mexico during difficult economic times because they were unable to provide basic sustenance for their families. Another group, perhaps smaller than the two groups previously mentioned, chose to come to the United States in search of better opportunities for themselves and their children. Most Mexican-Americans are not new immigrants, however. During the past several decades, far more Mexican-Americans (compared with other Hispanics) have been native rather than foreign born. The 1980 census showed that 74 percent of the Mexican-Americans counted were native born, compared to other Hispanic groups, whose native-born members made up from 20 to 49 percent of their total populations (Bean & Tienda, 1987).

Students may also vary in their language proficiency. Some are monolingual Spanish speakers. Within the monolingual Spanish-

speaking group, some are literate in Spanish while others are not. Across the limited-English proficient (LEP) group, their command of English may range from very limited to near proficient. Others may be limited in both languages.

### Educational Attainment Levels

Educational attainment figures for Mexican-Americans are reported under the umbrella category of "Hispanic." Because Mexican-Americans represent over 62 percent of Hispanics (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1988), data reported for Hispanics may be considered indicative of general levels in achievement for Mexican-American students. A study recently released by the American Council on Education (Carter & Wilson, 1991) reported a decline in high school completion rates for Hispanics, which in 1990 stood at 54.5 percent compared to 82.5 percent for Whites and 77.0 percent for Blacks. The researchers noted that high school completion rates for Hispanics had not improved significantly since 1970. Rather, the 1990 completion rate had dropped below the 55.2 percent Hispanic completion rate for 1973. They documented an even greater drop for Hispanic women, whose completion rate fell from 59.8 in 1989 to 55.2 percent in 1990. Steinberg, Blinde and Chan (1984) reported a similar trend. Among Hispanics the dropout rate rose steadily from approximately 30 percent in 1974 to 40 percent in 1979.

Data from the National Center for Education Statistics published in 1976 suggest that language minority status may be an even more important predictor of school achievement than ethnicity. Steinberg, Blinde and Chan (1984) analyzed the data by ethnic background to determine the percentages of students in grades 5 to 8 who were at least two years behind their expected grade level. Their findings showed that for students with an Anglo background, 8 percent were two or more years behind in school; for students with a non-Anglo, non-Hispanic background, the figure stood at 10 percent; and for students with Hispanic background, it was 12 percent. When the analysis was conducted using the classification according to language, rather than ethnicity, the differences were far greater. Only 8 percent of students who usually speak English were two or more years behind their expected grade level, compared to 25 percent of non-English, non-Hispanic language background students, and 32 percent of Hispanic-origin Spanish speakers.

Achievement in reading is measured by the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) using reading level indicators that

determine whether a student is an "adept" or "advanced" reader. Adept readers score above 300 and can understand complicated literary and informational passages. Advanced readers score above 350 and can use advanced reading skills to extend and restructure ideas in specialized and complex texts. Researchers Baratz, Snowden & Durán (Durán, 1988) compared achievement across three ethnic/linguistic groups: White non-language-minority students, Hispanic non-language-minority students, and Hispanic language-minority students. (Language-minority status refers to students whose first language is one other than English and who speak this language at home.) They found that at the 11th grade, Hispanic students are far less likely than Anglo non-language-minority students to score at the adept or advanced levels. While nearly half of all Anglo non-language-minority, 11th-grade students were classified at or above the adept level, only 27 percent of non-language-minority Hispanics scored at the adept level. For Hispanics from language minority backgrounds, the percentage of adept readers was much lower (14 percent). At the advanced levels, the percentages were: 6.5 percent Anglo, 3 percent non-language-minority Hispanic, and 1 percent language-minority Hispanic.

Throughout the high school years, Hispanic students are more likely to be over-age for their grade. Data from the High School and Beyond 1980 study indicated that 9.8 percent of Mexican-American high school seniors were two or more years older than the modal age for seniors. Only 2.5 percent of Anglos were above the modal age (Peng, 1982).

## Diversity Among LEP Students

> *My mother cries all night. I hold my little sister because she is scared, and I try not to think about our father. He was shot before we left. I don't do my homework most nights because it is so sad at home, and I try so hard to help. Now I am repeating the 10th grade. . . . I cannot keep up.*
>
> *—10th-grade Salvadoran girl who immigrated to the U.S. at age 12 (Olsen, 1988)*

Federally funded bilingual education programs were first implemented in the United States in the late 1960s, following the arrival of Cuban refugees. In 1968, Congress passed the Bilingual Education Act, also known as Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Students being served initially were almost exclusively

Spanish speaking and from varied socioeconomic backgrounds. Special language services were provided to students enrolled in the primary grades, usually in grades one through three. Subject matter was taught in Spanish and English using English-as-a-second-language (ESL) methodology. Older students entering public schools after the fourth grade had received previous schooling and were literate in their first language. These older students received ESL instruction exclusively.

From the late 1970s to the present, school personnel have witnessed an increase in the diversity of the LEP student population. During the 1970s, the U.S. population grew by 11.6 percent overall, while the number of Hispanics increased by 61 percent and Asian-Americans by 233 percent (Crawford, 1989). Since then, the annual number of legal entries has more than doubled, and the origins of newcomers have changed dramatically, shifting from developed nations to third-world countries (Crawford, 1989). Among Hispanics, Mexican-Americans grew in number by 30 percent while Central and South Americans grew by 67 percent (Quality Education for Minorities Project, 1990).

Unlike the Cuban refugees, many recent immigrants lack basic literacy skills in their native languages. More importantly, some recent immigrants lack prior experience with schooling and are unaware of school expectations and school culture. Besides cultural diversity, school personnel have experienced during this period an increase in the diversity of LEP students' home languages. Urban areas such as Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Chicago, for example, provide language-related services to students from as many as 40 to 70 different language groups.

### Trends and Projections

Presently, only one percent of the U.S. population is considered to be limited-English-proficient. However, within Vietnamese- and Spanish-speaking groups, approximately three out of every four persons, 75 percent, are considered to be LEP. For other language groups the percentage is lower: 40 to 53 percent of the population are considered LEP (Oxford-Carpenter, 1984). The high LEP count among Hispanics is of great importance for several reasons.

Hispanics represent the largest segment of the language-minority population in the United States. Hispanics account for 40 percent of the total LEP population and 64 percent of the school-aged population from a non-English-language background (Jenger & Sandhu, 1985).

**Characteristics of Students in Bilingual Programs of the 1970s Compared With the Late 1980s**

| Early 1970s | Late 1980s |
|---|---|
| Spanish speakers | diverse languages |
| grades 1-3 | all grade levels |
| immigrants literate in first language | immigrants, from 3rd world (many not literate in first language) |
| mixed socioeconomic backgrounds | 2 of 5 are poor (40%); 3 of 4 are in single, female households (75%); poverty is rising—has increased last 3 years |

Hispanics are a young group with a median age of 25 (Hispanic Policy Development Project, 1988). They are also the fastest growing ethnic group in the nation. From 1980 to 1989 they experienced a population growth of 39 percent, five times that of the nation as a whole. By the year 2000, the number of Hispanics will grow an additional 46 percent (Quality Education for Minorities Project, 1990). This dramatic growth could result in students receiving fewer services—especially when one considers that close to 90 percent of the Hispanic population is concentrated in nine states, with more than half of them living in California and Texas alone (Quality Education for Minorities Project, 1990). This trend has already been noted in a report from the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). The CCSSO report indicates that in 32 states with LEP populations, an average of 29 percent of LEP children were reported as unserved by bilingual or ESL programs.

At the school building level, students who attend urban schools with high percentages of minority students are at high risk of dropping out (Pallas, 1991); 88 percent of Hispanics reside in urban areas. Ten states with high Hispanic student enrollment have been found to be among the most segregated. According to Orfield, Monfort, and Aaron (1989), 59 percent of the students in New York and 41 percent of the students in Texas are enrolled in schools where nearly all (90-100%) of the students are minority. Moreover, many Hispanics attend

predominantly minority schools: New York (83.8%), New Mexico (78.8%), New Jersey (78.3%), Texas (77.7%), California (74.8%), Illinois (74.4%), Connecticut (68.2%), Florida (68.2%), Arizona (67.2%) and Pennsylvania (59.1%).

A high poverty rate among Hispanics places this group at an even greater educational disadvantage. The poverty rate among Hispanic 6- to 17-year-old children is 35.2 percent, compared with 41.9 percent among Blacks and 13.5 percent among Whites (Children's Defense Fund, 1990).

This data presents shifts in the populations of limited-English-proficient students enrolled in American public schools. These students possess varying language competencies and experiences and they face other obstacles besides language problems. These obstacles to achieving educational equity include low expectations, over-reliance on testing, poorly prepared teachers, scarcity of minority teachers, tracking, disregard of language and cultural diversity, and inadequate school financing (Quality Education for Minorities Project, 1990).

CHAPTER II

# Personal Factors Important for Success of Language-Minority Students

*Recollections about the first three years of my education are vague. The first year I recall the incident where I ran into one of my neighbors on the playground. The next year I remember crying because my friend and I had not been placed in the same classroom. Other memories about school have long since disappeared; however, there is one that persists to this day.*

*My teachers could never say my name. They figured that whoever named me "Gregoria" didn't know what they were doing and, therefore, called me "Georgie." The only thing I ever remember is standing by the teacher's desk, being hit on the hand with a ruler, making my palms sting and my eyes water. I felt so sad thinking she didn't like me. The next thing I remember I was in third grade making straight As, and I made the Honor Roll from then on. In high school I was inducted into the National Honor Society.*

*As I grew older and wiser I realized that the lack of bilingual education was what made my life such a blur my first three years of schooling.*

*—Gregoria Calderón, "My First Three Years of Schooling—Early 1960s" (Texas Association for Bilingual Education, 1988)*

Several reports have been issued regarding the factors associated with Hispanic student failure and the disproportionately high dropout rate. Few studies focus on the positive factors that help Hispanics achieve academically. Studies by Gándara (1982) and Varisco de García (1990) address the family characteristics of achieving Hispanic women. Overall, these studies tend to focus on factors external to the student, such as family support or mentoring and community programs. The following studies focus on students' personal influences on academic achievement.

## Academic Success

Cuellar (Cuellar & Cuellar, 1991) reported that some high-achieving students have suggested that academic excellence is related to students having the following influences: (a) friends and peer acceptance; (b) an interest in school as a whole, and not only in academic issues; (c) the approval of teachers, administrators, staff, and other authority figures; (d) support from all or some members of their family; (e) recognition and incentives for schoolwork of any kind; (f) good counseling; (g) periodic feedback; (h) more flexibility in planning and individualizing curriculum; and (i) participation in interdisciplinary academic projects. So (1987) concluded that a high-achieving disadvantaged student is one who aspires to values that are representative of the middle class and who also maintains strong communicative skills within the Hispanic culture.

Several of the above-mentioned influences rely heavily on personal ability to communicate and present oneself within a given language and culture—in the United States, English. For students whose first language is not English, the language and the culture will be a secondary one, acquired as a result of day-to-day interactions. These interactions can occur with native speakers who are members of the cultural group or with nonnative speakers.

Learning a second language is dependent on many factors, such as learning style, willingness to identify with the culture associated with the second language, and the opportunity for comprehensible input. However, schools take it as a given that students, raised in homes where languages other than English are spoken, will learn English in school and learn it well. Research by Vihman shows that different children take different routes to bilingual competence (in McLaughlin, 1984). Differences among students emerge, too, depending on whether children learn their languages simultaneously or successively.

## Social Interactions

According to Delgado-Gaitan and Trueba (1991), when children behave in ways appropriate to their sociocultural group, they generally gain approval and rewards from the adult members of the community. Depending on students' experiences, they will acquire different types of language and social norms. Factors—such as where the families reside; where the adults are employed; and where the family seeks recreation, religious, and educational services—all help determine the language and social norms children learn. For language-minority children, these processes become more complex be-

cause they often interact in more than one language group, and therefore acquire several sets of norms for interaction.

Students do not always succeed in communicating what they intend. For example, if a student does not possess the language for showing deference, he or she may be judged as rude or unruly. Students usually learn the command form for making requests before refining their language skills to include more polite forms. Teachers may misinterpret students' intentions if they do not understand this stage in language development.

Children's language proficiency impacts much more than their access to the printed page. How well children speak and interact with others provides information to listeners. Many listeners make judgments about a speaker's intentions, willingness to work or to cooperate, manners, intelligence, and ability to get along with classmates. It is extremely important, therefore, that educators become familiar with and recognize the differences in various stages of the language development process and can tell them apart from language or behavioral deficiencies.

CHAPTER III

# Instructional Factors Important for Success of Language-Minority Students

> *Instruction in the native language of LEP students allows them to participate in school and to acquire the skills and knowledge covered in the curriculum while also learning English. In addition it allows students to make use of the skills, knowledge, and experiences they already have and to build on those assets in school.*
>
> —*Eugene García, 1988*

At the classroom level, teachers who work successfully with Mexican-American students recognize that while the overwhelming majority of Mexican-Americans are native born, many are not native speakers of English, and they may or may not be bilingual or bicultural.

Thus, an appropriate language response program must address at least the following three goals: (1) students will become proficient in the English language, including understanding, speaking, reading and writing; (2) students will have access to quality instruction in the content areas in their native language (they will not fall behind their peers in these areas as they are learning English); and (3) students will experience validation and inclusion when their culture and background experiences are utilized.

## Current Achievement in Bilingual Education

Ramírez, Yuen, Ramey & Pasta (1990) compared the effectiveness of two alternative programs (structured English immersion and late-exit transitional bilingual education) with the early exit bilingual program, a program most typically funded by the U.S. Department of Education. Researchers found that students learned English in all three program types. However, they found that parents of the children enrolled in the late-exit program were better able to help them with their homework. Moreover, researchers found that the

students in the late-exit bilingual program made great achievement gains after several years in the program. Further analysis revealed that students in late-exit programs—who were provided with substantial instruction in their native language and who were gradually introduced to English as the language of instruction—showed the greatest growth in mathematics, English language skills, and English reading, effectively closing the achievement gap that characterizes the schooling of most language-minority children.

Lindholm (1991) studied the effects of a bilingual immersion model. They found that English- and Spanish-speaking students were scoring average to very high in Spanish reading and mathematics achievement by third grade, with the high proficiency groups of both English and Spanish speakers scoring in the 92nd to 98th percentile in reading and 83rd to 96th percentiles in mathematics.

Lindholm (1991) also found that the Spanish speakers were approaching average scores in English reading by fourth grade. This was considered significant because students had been introduced to English reading in the third grade. The researchers describe the difficulty for students in catching up with their native English-speaking peers, which requires students to make higher than average gains each year. They interpret the fast and significant gains as evidence that skills learned in one language (Spanish) transfer to the second one (English).

In another study of bilingualism and arithmetic problem solving among Hispanic first graders, Secada (1991) found: (1) Hispanic bilingual children enter first grade with greater competence for solving word problems than they are usually credited with; (2) the cognitive benefits of bilingualism might appear in academic subject work; and (3) the benefits depend on students' development of decontextualized, academic language proficiency.

Students in bilingual education perform well when they have access to instruction in the native language as they learn English. It is when students are "transitioned" prematurely to an all-English classroom that they can begin to flounder. When students enter the mainstream, they must interact with a teacher and students who do not understand what it means to learn and study in a second language in the context of a new culture.

Exited students face an additional obstacle when they encounter additional language changes. If they are exited at fourth or fifth grades, students encounter instruction which (1) is presented in their

newly acquired second language (English) and (2) requires them to read material for the purpose of learning content. In other words, they are required to read to learn instead of learning to read, which they did in the previous three grades. The reading task shifts from reading, on the one hand, narrative text with access to context clues from illustrations and concrete events, to longer, expository text with language that is decontextualized in the upper grades. At these upper elementary grades, students—recently exited from bilingual programs—must suddenly rely extensively on linguistic cues (the words themselves and the relationships they describe).

## Trends in Bilingual Education

The following section provides brief descriptions of effective instructional practices implemented in bilingual classrooms during the past 20 years.

**Developing literacy in the first language (L1).** Skutnabb-Kangas (1980) reported that even after seven years of Swedish instruction, Finnish immigrant children had not reached the average competence of Swedish children in the Swedish language. At the same time they had forgotten their native language faster than they had acquired Swedish. She predicted that for these students both languages would always remain much weaker than for monolingual speakers of either language. Skutnabb-Kangas sees semilingualism existing when the following factors are present: minority children from working class homes are forced to accept instruction in the foreign, majority middle class language, and their own language is a low-prestige language in school and in society.

The role played by the first language (L1) in the development of a second language (L2) is found in Cummins' (1979a) "Interdependence Hypothesis." According to Cummins, the development of L2 is partially a function of the level of L1 proficiency at the time when the student was first introduced to L2 intensively. Students whose L1 development is disrupted and replaced by L2 will suffer cognitive deficits. Related to this is Cummins' "Threshold Hypothesis" (1980), which proposes that certain threshold levels of language development in L1 must be reached by bilingual children in order to avoid cognitive deficits and to derive cognitive benefits of bilingualism. He also states that children who are not provided with the opportunity for continued L1 development will not develop the conceptual basis needed for abstraction in their first language. Without this, students

will lack the semantic knowledge necessary for developing fluent reading skills (Cummins 1979b).

Texas Education Agency guidelines, for example, like other state education agencies, call for decreasing the amount of instruction in Spanish as the student gains greater English fluency and moves into the upper elementary grades. Children will benefit when school personnel—recognizing that state requirements only specify *minimum* standards—provide opportunities for continued development of literacy in Spanish through the use of children's literature and the fine arts.

**Separating language use.** During the early years of bilingual education, teachers were encouraged to accept students' home language and to extend it. Discussions often centered on dialectal differences and teachers were chastised for criticizing students' use of Anglicisms or "Tex-Mex." Jacobson (1979) encouraged mixing the two languages or code-switching as a strategy for teaching the content areas.

Recently, researchers have criticized the mixing of languages for several reasons. Dulay and Burt (1978) and Wong-Fillmore (1982) reported that students did not attend to the English version and merely waited for the translation. In addition, they criticized this practice because it prevented the teacher from trying to negotiate the meaning with students while using English. That is, teachers made no attempts to simplify the language, add extra-linguistic cues or use gestures in an attempt to be understood. They simply translated. Similarly, students did not have to stretch themselves in attempting to negotiate meaning.

Gonzalez and Maez (1980) expressed concern that the lower status language would be used less often. Tikunoff (1983) found that, in 58 bilingual classrooms studied, teachers used English primarily but 25 percent of the time alternated to students' L1 to accomplish certain functions. According to Tikunoff about half the alternations were "instructional developments," about a third were "procedures and directions," and a fifth were "behavioral feedback to students." The main purpose for shifting to the L1 was to make sure LEP students could participate effectively in instruction provided in English. After reviewing several studies Wong-Fillmore and Valadez (1986) concluded that in classrooms where languages of instruction are not kept separate by time blocks, teachers predominantly use English as the language of instruction.

Teachers should accept code-switching by the students but they must carefully plan their Spanish instruction to achieve quality instruction in the native language. When using English, especially during reading or language lessons, teachers should strive to negotiate their language level so that it is not too elevated. Ideally, the teachers' language level should be only slightly higher than the students' language proficiency level. Teachers need to be aware that students' comprehension exceeds their production level.

**Developing cognitive and academic language proficiency.** Cummins (1984) has stated that in his studies immigrant children took four to seven years to learn English at a level that permits effective participation in instruction. He urges teachers to develop students' academic skills in L1 because the great majority of skills learned will transfer easily to the second language (English). Chamot and O'Malley (1986) have developed the *Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach* (CALLA), an ESL, content-based curriculum designed to teach language learning strategies to LEP students. The program prepares LEP students in the upper elementary and secondary grades for a transition to the mainstream subject areas in mathematics, science, and social studies. Instead of teaching language in isolation, CALLA uses English as a tool for learning other subject matter. Furthermore, CALLA teaches the literacy skills needed to read for information and write expository reports (Chamot & O'Malley, 1986).

**Developing ownership of what is learned.** In the Kamehameha Elementary Education Program (KEEP), students of native Hawaiian ancestry were encouraged to talk about their favorite features of books read at home the night before. Students selected the topics about which they wrote. Students gained ownership of literacy by participating in meaningful, relevant school learning experiences that legitimized their knowledge (Au & Jordan, 1981).

García (1987) used Cummins' model, which calls for reciprocal interaction in teaching. Effective bilingual teachers identified in his research asked Mexican-American students to contribute to the topic to be learned. These limited-English-proficient students discussed and selected topics. They also contributed information already known by individuals in the group. Teachers wrote students' responses and led students through a process for deciding what else they wanted to learn and for determining how they would gather the information. Initially, the discussions were in Spanish; a natural transition into English occurred by the end of the school year.

Using a sociocultural perspective, Moll (1992) calls attention to the many resources that are available to children outside of school. His research deviates from the usual deficit views about the achievement of language-minority youth. Working with Mexican-Americans in Arizona, Moll identified social networks that share "funds of knowledge," that is, the essential cultural practices and bodies of knowledge and information that households use to survive, to get ahead, or to thrive. He has experimented with ways in which the classroom teacher can utilize these funds of knowledge, which he sees as a potential major social and intellectual resource for the schools.

**Developing communicative competence.** Learning to speak in a grammatically correct manner is no longer considered the mark of a proficient speaker of a second language. Speakers must also be aware of the social rules of language use. Widdowson (1978) sees teaching language as having a communication focus. In 1980, Canale and Swain developed a framework. It includes four areas of knowledge and skills: grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence, sociocultural rules, and strategic competence. Students are also asked to use language for specific purposes. Teachers use syllabuses that contain the notions and functions of language.

Successful language teachers know the importance of modeling varied language expressions. Teachers model variety in their greetings and their requests to students, ranging from commands to very polite requests. They use and take the time to explain idiomatic expressions, including explanations about their origins or some interesting fact related to its use.

**Viewing students as active learners.** In the 1970s, methods for teaching language focused more on aspects related to the teaching act, i.e. on methodology and materials. Teachers used the audio-lingual method with its emphasis on language being learned through habit formation, rote-learning, and practice (Morley, 1987). In the 1980s natural processes were recognized and the role of the teacher shifted to that of a facilitator. According to Morley, the teachers and teaching materials must adapt to the learner rather than vice versa. Similarly, Wong-Fillmore, Ammon, McLaughlin and Ammon (1985) reported that the development of English production and comprehension was related to teacher responsiveness to student cues. Teachers who adjusted their linguistic interactions in response to student feedback were more likely to produce English language gains. Such adjustments included simplification of syntax, less rapid speech, and repeti-

tion. These teachers not only allowed but encouraged student interaction.

Recent research suggests that transmission-oriented teaching does not benefit minority students. For these students, as well as with language minority students, reciprocal interaction teaching has proven more effective (Cummins, 1989). García (1987) reported on instructional strategies used in effective bilingual classrooms. He suggests that student-to-student discourse strategies are important for enhanced cognitive and linguistic development.

**Using holistic approaches and themes.** In the early 1970s teachers received inservice training on methods for introducing initial reading instruction. Teachers acquired information about three methods for teaching beginning reading in Spanish: the phonetic method, the syllabic method, and the global method (Thonis, 1970). Because Spanish was such a phonetic language, the overwhelming majority of bilingual teachers initially used the phonetic method, with its letter-sound correspondence, followed by the combining of consonant-vowel combinations to form syllables. Students were expected to naturally make the transition to reading whole words and even phrases as these were repeatedly encountered. While teachers received inservice training on the use of the language experience approach, they reserved the use of this reading approach for teaching students to read in the second language. Moreover, teachers were asked to delay teaching writing until after a student was reading at a fluent level.

Kline (1988) reported that reading experts now focus on whole language development, integrating the teaching and learning of reading and writing, and the use of children's literature to counter skills-driven student basal readers. Bilingual education teachers ask their students to maintain dialogue journals and use predictable stories.

**Grouping students for collaborative work.** Increasingly, teachers are encouraged to use new classroom arrangements that enhance collaboration and group work, including planning tasks and discussing and reporting outcomes. Students develop group interaction skills as they learn thinking skills and extend their language skills. This educational practice is recommended for use with limited-English-proficient students (Calderón, 1989). Cooperative learning appears to make use of a learning style previously not tapped. Cooperative learning facilitates successful heterogeneous grouping, student verbalization and higher-order thinking.

**Reducing risk factors.** Educators working with LEP students have come to realize that learning English in and of itself will not guarantee achievement. We know that students whose home language is one other than English are one and one-half times as likely to leave school as native English speakers (Wagonner, 1988). Researchers have noted that Hispanics are twice as likely to drop out of school as their white counterparts (Cárdenas, Robledo and Supik, 1986). Reasons for dropping out vary, but lack of academic achievement stands out as a primary reason. The concern now is to reduce the number of risk factors that can contribute to students' dropping out. Bilingual program staff must address issues such as the following: (1) LEP student over-representation in special education, (2) LEP stu-

**Program Emphases for the 1990s Compared With the Previous Two Decades**

| 1970-1990 | | 1990s |
|---|---|---|
| Goal: | | |
| English learning | ⇨ | learn English, reduce risk factors |
| Language use: | | |
| bilingual | ⇨ | develop L1 literacy |
| Instructional methodology: | | |
| mix languages | ⇨ | separate languages, two-way language proficiency |
| ESL, teacher-centered | ⇨ | student-centered (active vs. passive) |
| analytic | ⇨ | holistic, thematic |
| linguistic competence | ⇨ | communicative competence |
| competition | ⇨ | collaboration |
| Student outcomes: | | |
| memory, comprehension | ⇨ | higher-order thinking skills |
| achievement on tests | ⇨ | performance assessment (portfolio) |

dents not being identified for gifted and talented programs, and (3) low teacher expectations for language minority youth.

### Issues Related to Instruction

Changes in instruction appear to be positive, and actively address recurring issues such as relevancy in the curriculum, students' lack of background knowledge, and the small amount of students' verbalization in the classroom. While the changes are just beginning, the author has observed school district inservice requests made to the Region VI Desegregation Assistance Center that reflect trends toward whole language and cooperative learning strategies. However, the need for improvement persists in several other areas and school districts need to take steps to implement appropriate responses.

For example, according to a report issued by the Council of Chief State School Officers (1990), not all eligible students are being served. In a survey of 32 states, an average of 29 percent of LEP children were reported as unserved by bilingual or ESL classes. Large numbers of LEP children also do not receive other special services they need to succeed in school. Many LEP students do not receive benefits of categorical programs, other than bilingual education, for which they may be eligible. These include compensatory education, vocational education, and special education (CCSSO, 1990; Schmidt, 1992).

It is also important to remember that not all bilingual classrooms resemble the ideal presented in bilingual pilot programs conducted by researchers, although the successes they document do provide direction for recommended practice. However, much work needs to occur before theory becomes practice. Usually, there is a 10-year gap between theory and the full use of an innovation. Currently, there is a need to improve the quality of training programs for teachers serving language-minority students, both at the university and school district levels, so that they can provide a more active learning environment for language and cognitive skill development (Ramírez, Yuen, Ramey & Pasta, 1990).

Even teachers in all-English classrooms need to receive training in teaching language-minority children. They need to become aware of cultural differences, cognitive styles, and language needs. These mainstream teachers should receive, at a minimum, inservice training on the use of English-as-a second-language methodology. Moreover, they need periodic reminders that while students may now be speakers of English, they never were, nor are they now, native speakers.

Consequently, teachers must check to see if students have the prerequisite background knowledge and vocabulary for meaningful learning of the materials and must be prepared to teach these if needed.

Additionally, exited students should be monitored for two years to determine if they are performing well in all-English classrooms.

## Summary

Bilingual education is a proven program of instruction. When properly implemented, bilingual instruction teaches students how to read in their native language, provides access to content via the native language (or specialized ESL) at the same time that they learn a second language. Over the past 20 years several trends have emerged. The most current thinking calls for accepting the diversity among LEP students, facilitating the teaching of ESL through lessons that actively involve students, using cooperative learning strategies, and organizing the learning materials into thematic units.

More importantly, research in bilingual education has identified the length of time it takes to acquire sufficient language capability to learn academic content in that second language (four to seven years). Research also indicates that time spent learning in the first language and continuing development of literacy skills will serve as a strong base for learning the second language not only faster but better. These two findings should lower educators' concerns for early exit. The implications of the research findings are clear. If school district personnel wish to increase students' success in all-English classes, they will increase the likelihood of this occurring by prolonging students' access to learning in their native language and continuing literacy development.

CHAPTER IV

# School Factors Important for Success of Language-Minority Students

*In 1936, Arcelia Jaso did not have a choice in her schooling. . . .There were three public schools in her South Texas community. The old brick school house was not as well furnished as the modern brick school house, nor as badly equipped as the metal-sided school building. Arcelia and the other Hispanic first graders went to school in the old brick building.*

*Arcelia, as well as all Hispanic children, was not allowed to speak Spanish in school. This did not become a problem until the fourth grade, when the children from the old brick building and the metal-sided school building transferred to the modern brick building. Early that year, Arcelia and a few of her friends were playing during recess and speaking in Spanish. A child overheard their conversation and shouted, "You ought to shut up, you greasy brown crayola!" Arcelia shouted back, "Leave us alone, you white trashy lemon juice!" A teacher had overheard the confrontation and reported Arcelia to the principal. She was paddled not only for speaking in Spanish but for starting a fight. Arcelia told her parents, and she was instructed never to speak Spanish in school again. Unfortunately, the antagonistic girl continued to call her names, which the teacher never seemed to have heard.*

*—Stephen Jaso Canchola*
*—Jennifer Mansell Canchola*
*Lancaster, Texas*

Schools have been identified as both the smallest and the largest unit of change. A Mexican-American student may have access to teachers who follow many of the instructional practices described in previous chapters and still not succeed because of institutional barriers like testing practices, the overall school climate, or low expecta-

tions on the part of other untrained teachers the student encounters. However, all language-minority students—not just a selected few—have the right to attend school and not be discriminated against because they speak (or once spoke) a language other than English. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 has defined national origin desegregation:

> National origin desegregation means the assignment of students to public schools and within those schools without regard to their national origin, including providing students of limited English proficiency with a full opportunity for participation in all educational programs.

A student's success should not be dictated by chance or luck when placed in a program of instruction. Federal mandates and directives provide guidance regarding the processes to be followed in determining the placement, the quality of the instructional program, and the monitoring and evaluative measures to be undertaken to ascertain if the language response program is producing results.

## Educators' Roles Redefined

In 1986, Cummins formulated a framework for empowering minority students. He suggested that a major reason for the failure of previous attempts at school reform was that relationships among the various participants had remained unchanged.

> I have suggested that a major reason previous attempts at educational reform have been unsuccessful is that the relationships between teachers and students and between schools and communities have remained essentially unchanged. The required changes involve personal redefinitions of the way classroom teachers interact with the children and communities they serve (p. 18).

In his framework, Cummins listed four structural elements in the organization of schools that contribute to the empowerment of minority students. These are (1) incorporation of the students' languages and culture, (2) the inclusion of community and parents in meaningful activities and decisions, (3) moving from a spoon-feeding of information to utilizing students' knowledge and intrinsic motivations for learning, and (4) taking an advocacy position on testing.

## Successful Schools

> *Being bilingual makes me feel important because someone who is bilingual knows more. I think being bilingual is very creative and smart. When people see that you are bilingual, they know that you are bilingually smart.... For example, when you go to Mexico, people there know what you want because you are bilingual.*
>
> *Being bilingual to me is knowing two languages, Spanish and English. If you are bilingual you could even be in a contest with those who know how to speak languages. Also, if people don't know Spanish and a Mexican talks to them in Spanish, you could translate it. You could also do it the opposite way.*
>
> *Did you know that you could be asked to be in a movie like the Spanish movie, "Carrusel"? American people will give anything to be bilingual. I feel so lucky to be bilingual.*
>
> *—Leslie Prieto, "Being Bilingual"*
> *5th Grade, Hoelscher Elementary, Edgewood ISD*
> *SAAABE 1991, First Place, Creative Writing Contest*

Carter and Chatfield (1986) and Garcia (1987) worked with bilingual elementary schools in California and Arizona to implement Cummins' framework combined with methods identified in the effective schools research. At the secondary level, Lucas, Henze, and Donato (1990) identified eight features considered to be key to the academic achievement of language-minority students (the majority of them Mexican-Americans) in six schools in California and Arizona.

According to Carter and Chatfield (1986), effective bilingual schools were characterized by (1) a well functioning total system producing a school social climate that promotes positive student outcomes, (2) specific characteristics crucial to the development of effectiveness (safe environment, positive leadership, strong academic focus, monitoring), and (3) a positive social climate (high expectations, nondeficit responses, high staff morale).

García (1987) studied seven bilingual classrooms in three Phoenix-area elementary schools whose students were achieving at or above grade level on standardized measures of school achievement. García noted a thematic, integrated curriculum, and classrooms where students collaborated and teachers used interactive teaching to provide support and develop higher-order thinking skills. In these classrooms, students' literacy development in Spanish (L1) was developed

through dialogue journals, initially using the native language, and later using English. Teachers' responses to the dialogue journals were related to the quantitative and qualitative character of journal entries made by students.

Teachers in García's study had a high sense of self-efficacy. They

**Summary of School Factors Important for Success of Language-Minority Students**

**School Leadership and Processes**

- Bilingual program is an integral part of the school program, not an add-on.
- Staff share a common vision (unity of purpose) and clarity of goals.
- Staff use processes to maintain and improve school effectiveness.
- Energy is expended on finding ways to meet student needs, not on winning turf or political battles.

**School Social Climate**

- Staff morale is high.
- Staff hold high expectations for students.
- Staff do not agree with the cultural deprivation argument or commonly held stereotypes.
- Resources are marshalled and problems solved as an effort to assist teachers in doing their job.
- Teachers have a sense that the system works.

**Curriculum**

- Textbook materials and lessons validate students' culture and history.
- Lessons are organized using thematic units.
- Curriculum promotes higher-order thinking skills.
- Language learning is promoted across content areas.
- Minimal use is made of ditto sheets or individualized work.

**Instruction**

- Students' language and culture are valued.
- Teachers impart high expectations and provide strong support.

had strong backgrounds and experience and saw themselves putting new theories and ideas into action. Communication about student progress occurred among teachers, with students, and with students' parents. Parents were actively involved in their children's education and supported their homework, even when they were not literate in English.

- Instructional conditions emphasize authentic communicative learning situations.
- Teachers use students' backgrounds and strengths in planning and implementing teaching episodes, making use of learning styles and collaborative work.
- Through interactive teaching, teachers provide opportunities for students to talk and write as a way to learn.
- Teachers develop students' higher-order thinking skills.
- A highly informal, family-like atmosphere exists, in which students help each other learn.

**Staffing**

- Staff do not subscribe to the deficit model. They know students have special needs but they do not use poverty, limited-English-proficiency, or lack of an educational legacy as an excuse. Staff place responsibility with the schools to adapt to meet the needs of the child.
- Staff have received university preparation and continued staff development about specific adaptations that can be made.
- Teachers have a high sense of self-efficacy. They know they can teach language-minority children (Mexican-Americans). They view neither the students, the parents, nor themselves as problems. Given enough time, or resources, they feel they can teach the content to the student.
- Staff see themselves as innovators.

**Assessment**

- Teachers and the principal monitor student progress.
- Assessment is conducted in the native language when appropriate.
- Testing is used for diagnostic purposes, to target help for students, not to justify inaction.
- On average, students are achieving at or very close to grade level (in either language).

CHAPTER V

# Creating School Systems that Support Instruction of Language-Minority Students

*I am proud that I'm Mexican-American, and I am also proud of my culture and religion. The Mexican-American is very lucky to know two languages. Even though I have a small accent, I'm still proud of being bilingual because my teacher says I communicate with others and write well in both languages.*

*Many people think that Mexicans are poor because they see them in movies or in television but, actually, there are many... rich people living in Mexico.*

*The Mexican religion has to do a lot with our culture and our background. In the history of Mexico, the Spanish were failing in their attempt to christianize [sic] the Indians but the Virgen [sic] of Guadalupe changed everything, and that's why we have a strong religion.*

*—Mario Menjares, "My Heritage"*
*5th grade, Stafford Elementary, Edgewood ISD*
*SAAABE 1992 Creative Writing Contest, First Place*

The previous two sections described the efforts of school districts and researchers who have searched for answers to the question of how to teach students whose first language is not English and whose culture varies from that found in most textbooks. These innovative and successful programs serve but a small portion of students needing special language response programs. Hundreds of thousands are being poorly served or not served at all.

This section urges school district leadership to think beyond serving students' language-learning needs and take other actions to improve outcomes for Mexican-American students. Those actions are described below.

## Know the Rights of Language-Minority Students

Language-minority students are those students from homes in

which English is not the predominant language of communication between parents and children (Wong-Fillmore, 1991). Students who have difficulty speaking, understanding, reading, or writing the English language are considered limited-English-proficient (LEP). School districts usually respond to these students by addressing their language learning needs. Federal guidelines and statutes, however, require school districts to identify LEP students, provide them a language response program, and evaluate the success of such a program. Should results indicate that the program is not producing the desired results, districts must determine the reasons why and change the program accordingly.

The language response program must, at a minimum, address three areas: (1) teaching LEP students the degree of fluency in English they need to be successful learners in an all-English classrooms; (2) ensuring that the LEP students receive understandable instruction in the content areas, using the native language or ESL to teach the content areas during the time they are learning English; and (3) providing catch-up assistance through tutoring, homework assistance, and accelerated learning that will enable students to keep up with their school work.

Federal guidelines and statutes prohibit school districts from any form of discrimination against such students because of their limited-English proficiency. Districts should not assign LEP students to an educational program or deny them access to a program on account of their limited language proficiency. This means that students cannot be placed in special education because of their limited English proficiency. It also means that students cannot be denied access or entry into gifted and talented programs because they are assessed to be LEP.

Further, through the May 25th Memorandum issued by the Office for Civil Rights, school districts have been directed to avoid tracking or placing LEP students in ability groups.

### Impart High Expectations

In 1981, Good documented the ways teachers interact with students they perceive as low achievers. Good found that with these students teachers tend to provide general, often insincere praise; provide less feedback; demand less effort; interrupt more often; distance themselves (that is, seat them farther away from the teacher); be less attentive; call for answers to questions less often; wait less time for responses to questions; be more critical more often; and smile less often.

Research shows that teachers form expectations on the basis of these factors: students' achievement records (O'Connell, Dusek, & Wheeler, 1974) or initial performances (Murray, Herling & Staebler, 1973); placement of minority children in special education which further influences expectations (Fair, 1980); a child's attractiveness (Clifford & Walster, 1973); a child's gender, with teachers interacting with boys more than girls and providing boys more cues (Dusek & Joseph, 1983). Other factors that lower teacher expectations include speaking a nonstandard dialect (Choy & Dodd, 1976), being poor (Yee, 1968; Mazer, 1971), and being of a race or ethnicity other than Anglo (Weinberg, 1977; Woodworth and Salzer, 1971).

Research has identified behaviors that communicate high expectations. These include using wait time (that is, giving students 3-5 seconds to formulate a response after asking a question), discussing wrong answers, giving appropriate rewards, praising, giving unambiguous feedback, giving more attention, providing role models, calling on minority students in a variety of ways, changing seating arrangements, providing challenges, varying types of questions, encouraging independence, and establishing rules. These behaviors have been found to work well with minority students. Researchers have documented the effectiveness of these behaviors with limited-English-proficient students, especially Mexican-American students (Carter and Chatfield, 1986; García, 1987; Lucas, Henze & Donato, 1990).

In addition to teacher-student interactions during teaching, expectations can be communicated through other means. These include the quality and content of the curriculum, and teacher and school responses to groups of students. School districts need to inform school personnel that racial slurs, and demeaning or degrading remarks against ethnic groups or groups of students will not be tolerated. In some communities, parents and teachers have communicated concerns about the treatment of recent immigrant students by other students and teachers. According to their report other Mexican-Americans students have discriminated against the new arrivals and have called them offensive names. Teachers, too, have been reported to use the term "recent immigrant" as a pejorative term.

In assessing your own district's support in the curricular area, examine the following:

1. Have you appointed a textbook selection committee?
   - Is this committee representative of all the groups in the district?

Does it include parents?

- Have they received training in the identification of stereotypes, issues of inclusion, and discrimination on the basis of ethnicity, language, gender roles, and other minority status?

2. Have you established criteria for evaluating appropriateness of the materials for language-minority and LEP students? For example:
   - Do instructional materials treat ethnic differences and groups honestly, realistically, and sensitively?
   - Do school libraries and resource centers have a variety of materials on the histories, contributions, and cultures of many different ethnic groups?
   - Does the curriculum examine the experiences of ethnic groups instead of focusing exclusively on heroes?
   - Does the curriculum present ethnics as active participants in our society?
   - Does the curriculum examine the diversity within each ethnic group's experience?
   - Does the curriculum develop higher-order thinking skills?
   - Does this book avoid the use of stereotypes and caricatures in portraying group differences and characteristics?

3. Have you allocated financial resources and authorized staff to purchase materials?

Note, the above list is not meant to be exhaustive. For further information, please refer to Banks (1988), *Multiethnic Education: Theory and Practice*, and Banks and Clegg (1990), *Teaching Strategies for Ethnic Studies*.

### Ensure Appropriate Student Placement

School district personnel place students in special programs on the basis of standardized achievement and intelligence test results. Students scoring below specified cutoff scores are placed in special programs such as remedial, special education, or tutorial programs. Students scoring much higher than the district or national average similarly get placed in special programs. High achievers are placed in honors courses or gifted and talented classes.

An important aspect of a district-wide support system involves the recognition that students with special gifts and talents come from all

cultural and linguistic backgrounds. School personnel need to be informed that (1) most procedures for identifying gifted and talented students have been developed for use with middle class, native-speakers of English; (2) the misuse of a single source of information, standardized tests, has led to an underrepresentation of minority-language students in gifted and talented programs; and (3) different learning styles and cultural differences produce manifestations of giftedness that differ from the traditional manifestations in the majority culture (Gallagher, 1985).

Research in this area has identified three percent as a conservative estimate of the percentage of the population that is considered gifted. Other researchers specify the expectation that five percent of the population will fall in the exceptional category, including special education for the gifted and talented.

To ensure a more equitable process, school districts should:

- assemble an identification and assessment committee;
- establish written entry criteria for the district;
- assess LEP students in their native language;
- use behavioral checklists or inventories;
- accept nominations from teachers and parents;
- followup and also use interviews, self-reports, autobiographies, and case histories; and
- monitor the percentage of students enrolled in gifted and talented programs.

In order to serve LEP students once they enroll in a gifted and talented program, several other actions need to occur at the district level. The gifted and talented program will need to be updated to be more inclusive in validating students' back ground knowledge and experiences. School personnel need to be sensitive to the fact that among many language-minority students, especially Mexican-Americans, two factors outside the school greatly influence the quality of their school experience: (1) a high poverty rate (40-42%) and (2) the absence of an educational legacy. In the past, school districts have confused lack of experience with lack of capability. As the numbers of minority students increase and the numbers of White students decrease in large, urban districts, it becomes imperative that school districts make a concerted effort to train teachers to be sensitive to these factors. More specifically, it will become imperative for school personnel to take a position that differs from the deficit and remediation

response traditionally used. In the 1990s and beyond, school district personnel will need to take on advocacy and mentoring roles for minority students. In the gifted and talented classrooms this will include use of the native language, teaching to multiple learning styles, bringing role models into the classrooms, and establishing mentoring relationships.

Similar issues have been voiced about the inappropriate placement of LEP students into special education. Ortiz (1986) has documented a 300 percent overrepresentation of LEP students in special education. The greatest number of LEPs in special education are found in the language and learning disability category. The lack of teacher inservice training in recognizing and understanding linguistic diversity (versus assuming linguistic disadvantage) is a major contributing factor. A second factor in overrepresentation of LEP students in special education is the students' lack of access to literacy skills, which stems from various sources: their language development stage, their teacher's limited teaching repertoire, or lack of literacy in the home. To reduce the large number of inappropriate referrals, researchers at the University of Texas have developed a comprehensive system that does not rely solely on test scores; reduces students' lags in background knowledge and literacy skills through the use of Graves' Writing Workshop (an approach to teaching beginning writing developed by Donald Graves in Australia—see Walshe, 1983), shared literature, and story maps (see Jett-Simpson, 1981; Beck & McKeown, 1981); and demonstrates and uses innovative teaching strategies for teachers to implement in their classrooms (Ortiz, 1986).

School district personnel must be charged with the need to confront overrepresentation in special education and underrepresentation in gifted and talented classes. Student achievement data serve as indicators. When discrepancies occur, the low scores should be a "red flag" for further exploration. Rather than accept low scores as indicators of real achievement or potential, school personnel will need to investigate possible causes for the low scores. Test results are influenced by factors such as invalid tests for limited-English proficient students, little or no provision of study skills, low teacher expectations, and parents' level of education.

### Work to Reduce the Achievement Gap

Educators and researchers have long noted the existence of an achievement gap between Mexican-American and Anglo students.

By the time Mexican-American students reach the sixth or seventh grade, they are two years behind their peers as measured by standardized achievement testing. According to the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) testing results, Hispanic 17-year-olds have reading, math, and science skills comparable to the skills of White 13-year-olds (Owen, 1991). In the past, teachers and administrators lamented this as a situation that they could not change. As the school reform movement gained momentum, teachers and administrators became uneasy. The effective schools and effective teaching research pointed out very clearly and dramatically that certain outcomes could be expected to occur if specific practices took place. School personnel could no longer use students' ethnicity, language, or socioeconomic position as excuses.

**Study areas of difficulty.** When working to support and enrich the learning experiences of language minority and Mexican-American students, school district personnel must firmly believe that these students are as capable as their peers. They must examine achievement data and program enrollments to *study areas of difficulty*. Some areas of difficulty will become readily apparent. Some students may have difficulty with prepositions since, in Spanish, the word *en* is used to denote *in, on,* and *on top of*. In English they would need to know the differences between these three positional words. Another area of difficulty could be in working with word problems, since much depends on being able to decipher the linguistic cues that denote special relationships and/or parameters.

Administrators and teachers can examine the areas of difficulty, plan strategies for addressing them, and evaluate the impact. Teachers can provide information on U.S. culture because they do not assume all students know the significance of the Mayflower, of pumpkins in the fall, or hay rides. Therefore, teachers need to inform students about the background, the practice itself, and its significance.

**Select the language of instruction**. In addition to providing background knowledge, teachers can *select the language of instruction* that would enable them to cover content most effectively. For example, if a teacher in a bilingual classroom is treating a cognitively complex subject or relationship, he or she may opt for presenting this in Spanish even when the student is near proficient in English. The LEP student would have access to the information, which will transfer to English. The student will know the concept but would need to learn only the labels or vocabulary. The teacher would simply need to teach

the vocabulary words at a later time. The time needed for this to occur would take a day or two at the most. Another strategy to allow student participation (and decrease a student's chance of falling behind) is to allow the student to respond in their native language to show comprehension of the content area material presented in English.

The present practice of testing LEP students reduces achievement averages. Some states will test students but will not count their scores. Other states have guidelines allowing school districts to provide a waiver of the required testing for LEP students. Generally, a waiver is applied only the first year that a student enters the school system as an LEP. Thereafter, even if the student is still categorized as LEP, the student will be required to take the English standardized achievement test even when they have been in the country only one year. Under these conditions, the test scores will remain low and will not reflect what students have learned; scores will only indicate large gaps in knowledge that students may have but cannot demonstrate when English is used for testing.

**Facilitate the exited student's transition.** To prevent erosion of learning gains made in the bilingual program, it becomes imperative that the bilingual educator *facilitate the exited student's transition* to an all-English program. The bilingual teacher needs to ensure success by anticipating which students will be transferred and monitoring their progress in an all-English instructional program. That is, the last semester that a student is in a bilingual program should ideally be primarily in English, with special assistance and support. The bilingual teacher would work to introduce vocabulary, provide background knowledge or give an advanced organizer in English to provide support for the new learning in the second language. Other forms of assistance can include the creation of word maps and story maps to help students analyze and comprehend reading selections.

When the student transfers to an all-English (monolingual) classroom, he or she will no longer have access to the use of the native language. The student and the teacher will both use English as the language of instruction. The teacher receiving exited LEP students will more than likely not have special certification or university preparation for teaching minority students whose first language is not English. They may or may not be familiar with language differences in bilingual students or students from low-income households. Thus, the potential exists for teachers to confuse lack of present competence with lack of ability. To continue supporting the student and to avoid

increasing the achievement gap, districts will need to provide inservice training to receiving teachers. Totally neglected in the past, the teacher receiving exited LEP students will need to be seen as part of the solution for decreasing the achievement gap. This will become more apparent as the number of Hispanic students doubles in thirty years and triples in sixty years.

## Take an Advocacy Position in Testing and Grade Retention

School districts need to examine their position regarding the impact of testing on atypical populations. Research indicates that minorities and women are affected negatively, especially with high-stakes testing (Maddaus, 1989; Rosser, 1987; Sosa, 1988). Minority and LEP students' competence may be underestimated by standardized tests. Therefore, school personnel should not rely exclusively on test scores to inform their decisions about promotion or qualification for entry into gifted and talented programs. Instead, school personnel need to make a concerted effort to find other sources of data; get validation from a variety of sources; and, in the case of a "borderline student," err in the student's favor. This would provide the student in question an opportunity to prove himself or herself. Otherwise, too much credence and weight would have been placed on an invalid measurement tool.

As school districts utilize testing for functions other than diagnosing for instructional improvement, staff need to understand the far-reaching effects of seemingly benign actions. For example, grade retention may seem to be a commonly occurring phenomenon. We all know someone who was retained, graduated and later blossomed. What one may not readily recognize is that this one person whom we know is an exception to the rule. Research in the dropout prevention arena shows a relationship between grade retention and dropping out. Students who are retained once have a 40-percent chance of dropping out; if they have been retained more than once, their likelihood of dropping out increases to 90 percent (Bachman, Green, & Wirtanen, 1971).

Over-agedness for grade level goes hand-in-hand with retention and also affects dropping out. For example, as recently as 1989, students in Texas could withdraw from school without needing parental consent upon reaching their sixteenth birthday. For many Mexican-Americans this birthday arrived while in the eighth or ninth

grade because they had been retained more than once. The Intercultural Development Research Association conducted a statewide study of the student dropout problem in Texas. Researchers found that the dropout rate for Hispanics in Texas (95 percent of whom were Mexican-Americans) was two and one-half times that of Whites (Cárdenas, Robledo & Supik, 1986). Furthermore, the study findings indicated that over one-half (53 percent) of the Hispanic students dropped out before completing the ninth grade.

The state of Texas has responded by changing from 16 to 17 the age at which a student can withdraw without parental permission. This measure will delay dropping out by one year but will not necessarily prevent it. School administrators need to examine data at a campus and school district level to ascertain grade retentions, over-agedness and dropout rates by ethnicity as well as gender and socioeconomic status. The school's response must address causes for the over-agedness and lack of achievement, not just symptoms or student responses to failure and frustrations, such as negative attitudes toward school and school personnel.

### Improve Staff Development and Minority Teacher Recruitment

Bridging the gap between theory and practice is a difficult task for any first-year teacher. For a bilingual teacher or a teacher working with minority students, this task becomes even more complex. Depending on their previous experience with students from various ethnic and socioeconomic levels, teachers will spend time and energy responding to misunderstandings, miscommunications, and misconceptions. If teachers have not been adequately prepared, they will not realize that they may have contributed to the problems they are facing.

Several states have instituted induction programs to assist new teachers in making the transition to becoming professional educators capable of effective teaching. Beginning teachers receive help from peer coaches or support teachers in areas important to serving culturally diverse populations. In particular, they receive assistance with classroom management, discipline, and adapting the curriculum.

School districts in states without formal induction programs would provide a greatly needed service if they were to provide mentors or support teachers for their beginning teachers. There is a need to see and know about other teachers who are successful with culturally and linguistically different children. Perhaps the greatest benefit can be

gained from visiting expert teachers and observing them in action. If the resources (time and money) necessary to carry out intervisitations among teachers are not available, then school districts can schedule inservice training that models the desired behaviors and engages teachers in application exercises.

Teacher recruitment will need to continue. The supply of minority teachers will decrease by the late 1900s, declining from 10 percent of the teaching force to a mere 5 percent (Quality Education for Minorities Project, 1990). This loss is expected to affect the education of minority and language-minority children because it will come at a time when minority students are expected to approach 50 percent of the student population in most urban school districts (Quality Education for Minorities Project, 1990).

Several factors affect the teaching pool, but two major factors need to be addressed immediately and definitely before the year 2000. These factors include the high Hispanic dropout rate of 45 percent and the increased use of competency testing at institutions of higher education. Only about 13 percent of Hispanic students enter college and, of these, less than half complete requirements for a bachelor's degree. In 1987, only 2.7 percent of all bachelor of arts degrees were earned by Hispanics, who comprised 5.3 percent of the undergraduate population (De La Rosa, 1990). Because fewer Hispanics are entering the teaching profession, the pool of Hispanic educators is further reduced.

Moreover, prospective teachers who are Hispanic face an additional challenge with the proliferation of college-level standardized testing required for entry into the teaching field. A study conducted by Pritchy-Smith (1987) reported that since the inception of this required testing, over 10,000 Hispanic prospective teachers have been excluded from the teacher education field. In the past five years since that study was conducted, thousands more have been denied entry into teacher education.

Oklahoma is a state that has responded positively to this challenge. Provisions in House Bill 1017, a school reform act, called for the establishment of a center for minority teacher recruitment. The legislature directed the State Board of Education to work with the state Regents for Higher Education in developing a minority recruitment program that would also include training and placement. The goal of the program was to bring ethnic and cultural diversity into the classroom.

Two years after the program was established, students are being placed in cross-cultural classrooms to help prepare them for teaching in classrooms having diverse student populations. Students participate in the Middle School and Pro-Team programs, which include activities such as peer tutoring, assisting in classrooms, and volunteering for community activities. At the high school level, bright, motivated students who are interested in a teaching career join the Teacher Cadet Program. They have direct contact with teachers and students. School districts in this state can expect to have an available minority teaching pool that is grounded in valuable experiences.

### Involve Parents in Meaningful Activities

Like other parents, parents of Mexican-American students want the best for their children. They want them to become educated and productive citizens. However, the lack of Hispanic parents' involvement with the schools has been interpreted to mean that they are not interested in education.

Recent research by the Hispanic Policy Development Project (Nicolau & Ramos, 1990) has shed new light on this subject. As a result of interviews with hundreds of Hispanic parents, researchers concluded that Hispanic parents tended to hold very high regard and respect for authority. Parents did not see how they, who were not educated, could provide input to educators who have received extensive training and hold many credentials. A second finding of this report was that Hispanic parents tended to not respond to printed notices sent via the children. Hispanic parents were more likely to attend school meetings and events when contacted face-to-face, by telephone, or through encouragement by neighbors. It appears that it is not a question of disinterest on their part but a question of expectations and techniques used.

School district personnel working with parents need to stop operating from a deficit model and begin looking at an enrichment model, with the belief that Hispanic parents (for the most part) want to help their children but may not know how or where to start. Hispanic parents who are the first or second generation in the United States, or are recent immigrants, may not be aware that educators in this country expect parental involvement. Training will need to be provided to parents regarding expectations for involvement, areas of involvement, and techniques for communicating with the schools.

School completion rates may also differ from their country of

origin. For example, in Mexico and Central American countries students not going on to college are thought to have completed their education if they finish the eighth grade. Once the school district broaches and confronts the attitudinal barriers to parental involvement, staff must examine other barriers to their involvement and work to diminish these. Henderson, Marburger, and Ooms (1986) divided these barriers into two major categories: logistics and attitudes. Logistics problems involved lack of time for working parents; intense financial pressures; badly lit campuses leading to safetly issues (both inner-city and urban); and lack of child care at home, with none provided at school.

Barquet (1990) has suggested that parental involvement becomes more relevant to language-minority populations when it is intergenerational and includes extended families and the communities to which the children belong. She notes that the contributions that extended families and other community members can make to the schools are numerous and should be utilized to enrich the school curriculum and programs. Barquet states that successful parent involvement programs offer services such as translation, babysitting, transportation, and social services referrals to facilitate the attendance of parents at school-related functions and activities. The task before schools becomes to redefine the roles for parents and educators, remove the barriers to meaningful and equitable participation by language-minority parents, and select outreach techniques that are culturally appropriate.

## Summary

Historically, services to LEP students have been provided under the umbrella of "special programs." This status centralizes the concerns, issues and resources under the leadership of a bilingual program director. Providing adequate services to LEP students should be the concern, as well, of school districts' top level of administration. Federal laws and mandates require that specific actions and services be delivered and monitored for their effectiveness. The actions of the districts' leadership sets the tone for marshalling resources and seeking solutions to persistent problems encountered when implementing special programs.

Certain support functions such as curriculum selection, staff recruitment and training, assessment, and parental involvement need to be reexamined in light of bilingual and bicultural aspects of a school's

community. Cultural validation and principles of inclusion must permeate the context in which these functions are implemented. Parental involvement and staff training should be planned around specific needs that emerge in bilingual and bicultural classrooms.

CHAPTER VI

# Meeting the Challenges for the 1990s: Policy Recommendations

The purpose of this monograph has been to describe the significant need for school districts to address educational equity for Mexican-Americans in U.S. public schools. The monograph has defined educational equity in terms beyond the issue of access to programs and services, extending to ensuring that special programs fulfill their intended outcomes. Proof that equity exists comes when students, regardless of their race, ethnicity, first language, gender, or socioeconomic level achieve, graduate, enroll in college, participate in gifted and talented programs, and take advanced mathematics and science courses at equally high rates.

High achievement on the part of all students is important. However, as the minority population increases, educators and community leaders recognize the need to address the deplorably low levels of educational attainment traditionally achieved by Mexican-Americans. Success in this effort will greatly depend on the approach utilized. Past efforts at remediation have had limited success. Reports from the U.S. Department of Education have implicated that the remediation efforts themselves cause students to remain further behind in the mastery of content.

In the past, educators blamed students' lack of success on their speaking a home language other than English and on the lack of school participation by their parents. In the 1980s researchers published findings to the contrary. The seminal work of Skutnabb-Kangas (1980), Troike (1978), Cummins (1979a), and Hakuta (1986) demonstrated that development of the second language depended, to a large extent, on development of the first or native language. Students who immigrated after achieving reading and writing skills learned English not only faster but they also learned it better. Similar positive relationships were found for native-born Mexican-Americans who remained in late-exit bilingual programs.

Researchers have identified a common underlying proficiency that facilitates the transfer of skills from the first to the second language. Thus, while it may seem contradictory, time spent learning content and skills in a first language is time well spent. When the student transfers to an all-English classroom, the teacher need not reteach the concepts or skills. The teacher need only teach the English labels or vocabulary, a much easier task than trying to teach abstract concepts or cognitively demanding tasks in language unfamiliar to the student.

During the late 1970s and early 1980s researchers documented the initial achievement gap that is often found in bilingual education programs. However, longitudinal studies of students in bilingual education programs showed dramatic growth spurts after five years in the program. Student achievement equaled or surpassed that of native-language speakers.

The advent of effective schools research and the school reform movement proved beneficial to Mexican-American students, particularly those who were limited-English-proficient. Several researchers (Tikunoff, 1983; Carter and Chatfield, 1986; Garcia, 1987) applied the effective schools literature within bilingual settings. The central belief among the teachers studied was that these students could learn—if only certain practices were followed. This belief, coupled with a high sense of their own efficacy as bilingual teachers, compelled the teachers to try instructional practices that validated the students' sense of identity and provided support for enriching their cognitive, linguistic, and literacy skills. This was done first in Spanish and continued in English. Most importantly, teachers tried techniques to help students learn in an active manner utilizing cooperative learning strategies and providing tools for them to remember and access the new information learned in the second language (through word and story maps, for example).

The results yielded by the innovative practices reach beyond an exercise in practice teaching. They are a clear testimonial to the power of belief and the benefits of concerted effort. These results open up the possibilities and benefits to be derived in other situations—if only certain things are done. Educators sometimes use research findings or correlations between factors to rationalize the status quo. The information presented in this monograph indicates the progress that can be made when a different posture is assumed, namely that of an advocate for students. Great progress can be made when educators look beyond Mexican-American students' existing lags in English speak-

ing and reading skills, refuse to equate current lack of competency with lack of ability, acknowledge the wisdom of building on strengths versus furthering weaknesses through remediation that focuses on deficits, and accept the axiom that continued development of the first language serves as a strong base for learning the second language.

## Recommendations

Depending on state laws and guidelines, school district personnel may be required to compile data on student outcomes. The most common data compiled are students' achievements as measured by standardized tests. Students' mastery of expected learner outcomes for a grade are also commonly computed. However, not all school districts maintain accurate, disaggregated data that show student treatment, student placement, and student outcomes. While school personnel may be able to provide a school district average or a school average, data is not always available showing achievement breakdowns by gender, race, ethnicity, and/or socioeconomic status. Yet national statistics point to great achievement gaps that can be noted between males and females in mathematics and science. Moreover, national figures indicate that 40 percent of White dropouts and 60 percent of Black and Hispanic dropouts are from low socioeconomic households.

Unfortunately, even though poverty greatly impacts students' chances of success in school, the children of poverty are not a protected class. School districts are not prohibited by law from discrimination in education for this group. Thus, they are not likely to be sanctioned by the federal agencies responsible for monitoring equality in educational opportunities.

At the school policy level, five actions need to be taken, as outlined in this section.

1. **Disaggregate student data.** School district policymakers should request access to disaggregated data (by race, ethnicity, gender, and socioeconomic level) to identify areas of needed improvement. Information should be compiled on the numbers and percentages of the following groups:

- students retained,
- over-aged students,
- students in academic tracks,
- students in vocational tracks,

- students taking advanced courses,
- students passing state competency exams,
- students graduating, and
- students taking college entrance examinations.

In addition to information on academic achievement, disaggregated data should be compiled on program placement. Among Mexican-Americans in Texas, there exists a 300 percent overrepresentation in special education classes. The great majority of students are limited-English-proficient students who have been diagnosed and placed in special education because they were identified as having language and learning disabilities. A problem of underrepresentation exists when one examines the placement of Mexican-Americans into gifted and talented programs, especially students who are limited-English proficient.

Finally, school districts need to be aware of inequities in the application of disciplinary action across racial and ethnic groups.

**2. Demonstrate commitment to uphold civil rights laws.** The second policy that must be established and acted upon is to send powerful messages to staff members about "the way things must be" with regard to language-minority students' civil rights. When put into practice, these messages reinforce expected behavior and apply sanctions to those acting contrary to expectations. For this reason, it is important that top-level administrators demonstrate seriousness in their intentions, especially with regard to banning discrimination in public schools.

Language minority students, including Mexican-American students whose first language is one other than English, are protected against discrimination in education under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The Civil Rights Act reads, in part, as follows:

> No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program receiving Federal financial assistance.

The Office for Civil Rights—the monitoring branch of the U.S. Department of Education—has issued guidelines for school districts. The May 25th Memorandum (1970) affirmed the application of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to language-minority students (see Lyons, 1988). Through this administrative memorandum, which has the force of law, school districts in the United States were specifically

directed to avoid tracking or placing students in ability groups on the basis of language proficiency. The May 25th Memorandum set forth four injunctions:

- Where inability to speak and understand the English language excludes national-origin-minority-group students from effective participation in the educational program offered by a school district, the district must take affirmative steps to rectify the language deficiency in order to open its instructional program to these students.
- School districts must not assign national-origin-minority-group students to classes for the mentally retarded on the basis of criteria that essentially measure or evaluate English language skills; nor may school districts deny national-origin-minority-group children access to college preparatory courses on a basis directly related to the failure of the school system to inculcate English language skills.
- Any ability grouping or tracking system employed by the school system to deal with the special language skill needs of national-origin minority children must be designed to meet such language skills needs as soon as possible and must not operate as an educational deadend or permanent track.
- School districts have the responsibility to adequately notify national-origin-minority-group parents of school activities that have been called to the attention of other parents. Such notice, in order to be adequate, may have to be provided in a language other than English.

**3. Pursue excellence and equity (not simply compliance).** The school district's third policy action must go beyond simple compliance. The Office for Civil Rights does not currently have guidelines for school districts serving language-minority students. No one instructional program is required or recommended. However, the Office for Civil Rights relies very heavily on a three-part test to determine appropriateness of a language response program. The three-part test stems from a 1981 court decision, *Castañeda v. Pickard*, issued by the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals. Plaintiffs in this case were the parents of Mexican-American students who made up 80-100 percent of the student population in the Raymondville (Texas) Independent School District.

The plaintiffs claimed the school district had violated the Fourteenth Amendment, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act, and the Equal Educational Opportunity Act (EEOA) rights of Mexican-American

students. The following policies were specifically questioned: ability grouping on the basis of ethnicity or race resulting in segregation, discrimination in hiring and promotion of Mexican-American faculty and administrators, and failure to implement adequate bilingual education programs. As a result of the Castañeda case, the Office for Civil Rights uses a three-part test to measure compliance with the EEOA requirement of appropriate action. The three-part test measures compliance with regard to theory, practice, and results, as briefly outlined below:

- **Theory**. The court's responsibility, insofar as educational theory is concerned, is only to ascertain that a school system is pursuing a program informed by an educational theory recognized as sound by some experts in the field or, at least, deemed a legitimate experimental strategy.
- **Practice.** The court's second inquiry would be whether the programs and practices actually used by a school system are reasonably calculated to implement effectively the educational theory adopted by the school. We do not believe that it may fairly be said that a school system is taking appropriate action to remedy language barriers if, despite the adoption of a promising theory, the system fails to follow through with the practices, resources, and personnel necessary to transform the theory into reality.
- **Results.** If a school's program, although premised on a legitimate educational theory and implemented through the use of adequate techniques, fails (after being employed for a period of time sufficient for a legitimate trial) to produce good results, the program may no longer constitute appropriate action. We do not believe Congress intended that under Section 1703(f) a school would be free to persist in a policy that has, in practice, proved a failure.

**4. Identify a top-level administrator as an equity advocate.** The fourth powerful policy action the district can take relates to advocacy. Recently, a national study of Chapter I services concluded that LEP students are being denied remedial help through Chapter I (Strang & Carlson, 1991). The report concluded that school districts tended to be less likely to identify children from poor backgrounds as eligible for Chapter I services if those students were also limited-English-proficient. Inadequate evaluation procedures and misinterpretation of federal regulations by school personnel were cited as major reasons for not providing the needed services.

Directors of special programs such as Chapter I, bilingual educa-

tion, and migrant and special education are usually selected from the ranks on the basis of their advocacy and competence in providing needed services to a particular population of students. However, program directors have little authority over other programs. It is necessary to develop advocacy among central administration having a supervisory role across special programs and the mainstream curriculum.

**5. Join the equity network.** Lastly, the U.S. Department of Education funds ten regional desegregation assistance centers (DACs) (see box, next page). Their mission is to assist school districts in opening up the curriculum to students. The centers provide training and technical assistance to school personnel, parents, and community members. Many of the DAC centers publish newsletters and disseminate information about trends and issues in educational equity. Membership organizations similarly provide conferences, workshops and newsletters. These include groups like the National Committee on School Desegregation, the National Association of Multicultural Education, the National Coalition of Advocates for Students, the National Center for Fair and Open Testing (Fairtest), the National Coalition of Sex Equity in Education (NCSEE), and the National Association for Bilingual Education (NABE). Through these associations, school personnel and community members can keep up to date on the latest research, emerging issues, and areas needing immediate action. These persons can then serve as catalysts for change in their own school districts or schools with the impetus and support derived from these advocacy organizations.

## Desegregation Assistance Centers

**Center for Educational Equity**
**Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory**
2550 S Parker Rd - Ste 500
Aurora CO 80014
Shirley McCune, Director
303/337-0990, ext. 3029
FAX: 303/337-3005
States served: CO, MT, ND, SD, UT, WY

**Desegregation Assistance Center**
**Interface Network, Inc.**
4800 SW Griffith Dr - Ste 202
Beaverton OR 97005
Miguel Valenciano, Director
503/644-5741
FAX: 503/626-2305
States served: AK, HI, ID, OR, WA, American Samoa, Guam,

**Desegregation Assistance Center**
**New York University**
32 Washington Place - Rm 72
New York NY 10003
Donna Walters
212/998-5100
FAX: 212/995-3474
States served: NJ, NY, PR, VI

**Desegregation Assistance Center**
**Intercultural Development Research Association**
5835 Callahan - Ste 350
San Antonio TX 78228
Alicia Salinas Sosa
512/684-8180
FAX: 512/684-5389
States served: AR, LA, NM, OK, TX

**Mid-Atlantic Equity Center**
**The American University**
5010 Wisconsin Ave NW - Rm 310
Washington DC 20016

Sheryl Denbo
202/885-8517
FAX: 202/363-0632
States served: DE, DC, MD, PA, VA, WV

**Midwest Desegregation Assistance Center**
**Kansas State University**
401 Bluemont Hall
Manhattan KS 66506
Charles Rankin
913/532-6408
FAX: 913/532-7304
States served: IA, KS, MO, NE

**New England Center for Equity Assistance**
**The NETWORK**
300 Brickstone Square - Ste 900
Andover MA 01810
David Max McConkey
508/470-1080
FAX: 508/475-9220
States served: CT, ME, MA, NH, RI, VT

**Programs for Educational Equity**
**University of Michigan**
School of Education
1033 School of Education Bldg
Ann Arbor MI 48109
Percy Bates
313/763-1229
FAX: 313/763-1229
States served: IL, IN, MI, MN, OH, WI

**Southeastern Desegregation Assistance Center**
**Southern Education Foundation**
8603 S Dixie Hwy - Ste 304
Miami FL 33143
Gordon Foster
305/669-0014
FAX: 305/669-9809
States served: AL, FL, GA, KY, MS, NC, SC, TN

*(continued)*

**Southwest Center for Educational Equity**
**Southwest Regional Laboratory**
4665 Lampson Ave
Los Alamitos CA 90720
Harriet Doss Willis
213/598-7661
FAX: 213/985-9635
States served: AZ, CA, NV

## Other Organizations Involved in Providing Information About Educational Equity

**Council for Exceptional Children (CEC)**
Department of Professional Development
1920 Association Dr
Reston VA 22091
Grace Z. Duran, Spec. Asst. for Ethnic and Multicultural Concerns
703/620-3660

**ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools (ERIC/CRESS)**
Appalachia Educational Laboratory
PO Box 1348
Charleston WV 25325
800/624-9120

**National Association for Bilingual Education**
810 1st St NE - 3rd Fl
Washington DC 20002-4205
202/898-1829
FAX: 202/289-8173

**National Association for Multicultural Education**
PO Box 9657
Arlington VA 22219
703/243-4525

**National Center for Fair and Open Testing (FAIRTEST)**
342 Broadway
Cambridge MA 02139
617/864-4810

**National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning**
Kerr Hall
University of California at Santa Cruz
Santa Cruz CA 95064
408/459-3500

**National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education**
1118 22nd St NW
Washington DC 20037
Information Specialist
202/467-0867
800/321-NCBE
FAX: 202/429-9766

**National Coalition of Advocates for Students**
100 Boylston St - Ste 737
Boston MA 02116
617/357-8507

**National Coalition for Sex Equity in Education (NCSEE)**
1 Spruce Rd
Clinton NJ 08809
908/735-5045

**National Committee for Citizens in Education**
10840 Little Patuxent Pky-Ste 301
Columbia MD 21044
Sheryl Johnson
202/408-0447
FAX: 202/408-0452
Parent Education Help Line: 800/638-9675
Education Help Line for Hispanic Community: 800/532-9832

**National Committee for School Desegregation**
Rm 510 Administration Bldg
21st St South of the Parkway
Philadelphia PA 19103
215/299-7672
FAX: 215/299-8940

# References


Au, K. H., & Jordan, G. (1981). Teaching reading to Hawaiian Children: Finding a culturally appropriate solution. In H. Trueba, G. P. Guthrie, & K. H. Au (Eds.), *Culture and the bilingual classroom: Studies in classroom ethnographies* (pp. 139-152). Rowley, MA: Newbury Howse.

Bachman, J. G., Green, S., & Wirtanen, I. D. (1971). *Youth in transition. Volume III. Dropping out—problem or symptom?* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research.

Banks, J. A. (1988). *Multiethnic education: Theory and practice* (2nd ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Banks, J. A., & Clegg, A. A. (1990). *Teaching strategies for the social studies: Inquiry, valuing & decision-making* (4th ed.). White Plains, NY: Longman.

Barquet, N. (1990). Parent involvement in American education: A national origin perspective. *Equity Coalition for Race, Gender and National Origin, 1*(2), 4-6.

Bean, F., & Tienda, M. (1987). *The Hispanic population of the United States* (for the Committee for Research on the 1980 Census). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Beck, I. L., & McKeown, M. G. (1981). Developing questions that promote comprehension: The story map. *Language-Arts, 58*(8), 913-918.

Black, M. (1989). *Minority Student Issues: Racial/Ethnic Data Collected by the National Center for Education Statistics Since 1969.* Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

Calderón, M. (1989). Cooperative learning for LEP students. *IDRA Newsletter, 16*(9), 1-7.

Canale, M., & Swain M. (1980). Theoretical basis of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics, 1*, 1-47.

Cárdenas, J., Robledo, C., & Supik, J. (1986). *Texas school dropout survey project: A summary of findings*. San Antonio, TX: Intercultural Development Research Association.

Carter, D. J., & Wilson, R. (1991). *Minorities in higher education: Ninth annual status report*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Carter, T., & Chatfield, M. L. (1986). Effective bilingual schools: Implications for policy and practice. *American Journal of Education, 95*(1), 200-232.

Chamot, A. U., & O'Malley, J. M. (1986). *A cognitive academic language learning approach: An ESL content-based curriculum*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Children's Defense Fund. (1990). *Latino youths at the crossroads*. Washington, DC: Author.

Choy, S. J., & Dodd, D. H. (1976). Standardized English-speaking and nonstandard Hawaiian-English-speaking children: Comprehension of both dialects and teachers' evaluations. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 68*, 184-193.

Clifford, M. M., & Walster, E. (1973). Research notes: The effect of physical attractiveness on teacher expectations. *Sociology of Education, 46*, 248- 258.

Council of Chief State School Officers. (1990). *School success for limited English proficient students: The challenge and state response*. Washington, DC: Author.

Crawford, J. (1989). *Bilingual education: History, politics, theory and practice*. Trenton, NJ: Crane Publishing Company.

Cuellar, A., & Cuellar, M. (1991). Winner's and loser's circles: Conceptions of social and school based factors affecting student achievement. *The Journal of Educational Issues of Language Minority Students, 9*, 115-136.

Cummins, J. (1979a). Cognitive/academic language proficiency, linguistic interdependence, the optimum age question and some other matters. *Working papers on bilingualism (No. 19).* Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Cummins, J. (1979b). Linguistic interdependence and the educational development of bilingual children. *Review of Educational Research, 49*(2), 222-251.

Cummins, J. (1980). The cross-lingual dimensions of language proficiency, implications for bilingual education and the optimal age issue. *T.E.S.O.L. Quarterly, 14*(2), 175-187.

Cummins, J. (1984). *Bilingualism and special education: Issues in assessment and pedagogy.* Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Cummins, J. (1986). Empowering minority students: A framework for intervention. *Harvard Educational Review, 56* (1), 18-36.

Cummins, J. (1989). *Empowering minority students.* Sacramento, CA: California Association for Bilingual Education.

De La Rosa, D., & Maw, C.E. (1990). *Hispanic education: A statistical portrait 1990.* Washington, DC: National Council of La Raza.

Delgado-Gaitan, C., & Trueba, H. (1991). *Crossing cultural borders: Education for immigrant families in America.* Bristol, PA: The Falmer Press.

Dulay, H., & Burt, M. (1978). From research to method in bilingual education. In J. E. Alatis (Ed.), *Georgetown University Round Table on Language and Linguistics.* Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Durán, R. P. (1988). *Testing of hispanic students: Implications for secondary education.* Berkeley, CA: National Commission on Testing and Public Policy, University of California, Santa Barbara.

Dusek, J. B., & Joseph, G. (1983). The bases of teacher expectancies: A meta- analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 75(3),* 327-346.

Epstein, J. L., & MacIver, D. J. (1990). *Education in the middle grades: Overview of national practices and trends. Report No. 45.* Baltimore, MD: Center for Research on Elementary and Middle Schools.

Fair, G. W. (1980). Coping with double-barrelled discrimination. *Journal of School Health, 50*, 275-276.

Gallagher, J. (1985). *Teaching the gifted child* (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Gándara, P. (1982). Passing through the eye of the needle: High-achieving Chicanas. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 4*(2), 167-179.

García, E. E. (1987). *Effective schooling for language minority students* (New Focus, NCBE Occasional Papers in Bilingual Education, No. 1). Wheaton, MD: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

García, E., Flores, B., Moll, L., Prieto, A., & Zucker, S. (1988). *Effective schools for hispanics* [Monograph]. Santa Cruz: University of California.

Gonzalez, G., & Maez, L. F. (1980). To switch or not to switch: The role of code-switching in the elementary bilingual classroom. In R. V. Padilla (Ed.), *Ethnoperspectives in bilingual education, Volume II*. Ypsilanti: Eastern Michigan University.

Good, T. L. (1981). Teacher expectations and student perceptions: A decade of research. *Educational Leadership, 38*(5), 415-422.

Guskey, T. R. (1990). Integrating innovations. *Educational Leadership, 47*(5), 11-16.

Hakuta, K. (1986). *The mirror of language*. New York: Basic Books.

Henderson, A., Marburger, C., & Ooms, T. (1986). *Beyond the bake sale: A educator's guide to working with parents*. Columbia, MD: National Committee for Citizens in Education.

Hispanic Policy Development Project. (1990). *Closing the gap for the U.S. Hispanic youth*. Washington, DC: Author.

Jacobson, R. (1979). Can bilingual teaching techniques reflect bilingual community behaviors? A study in ethnoculture and its relationship to some amendments contained in the new bilingual education act. In R. V. Padilla (Ed.), *Ethnoperspectives in bilingual education, Volume I* (pp. 483-497). Ypsilanti: Eastern Michigan University.

Jenger, S., & Sandhu, H. (1985). *Southeast Asian refugees: English language development and acculturation* (Focus No. 21). Rosslyn, VA: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Jett-Simpson, M. (1981). Writing stories using model structures: The circle story. *Language Arts, 58* (3), 293-300.

Kline, L. W. (1988, June). Reading: Whole language development, renewed focus on literature spur change. *Curriculum Update, 1* (4), 9.

Lindholm, K. J. (1991). Theoretical assumptions and empirical evidence for academic achievement in two languages. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 13* (1), 3-17.

Lucas, T., Henze, R., & Donato, R. (1990). Promoting the success of latino language-minority students. An exploratory of six high schools. *Harvard Educational Review, 60*(3), 315-340.

Lyons, J. J. (1988). *Legal responsibilities of education agencies serving national origin language minority students.* Washington, DC: The American University, Mid-Atlantic Equity Center.

Maddaus, S. (1989). The influence of testing on the curriculum. In L. N. Tanner (Ed.), *Critical issues in curriculum*: 87th yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Mazer, G. E. (1971). Effects of social class stereotyping on teacher expectations. *Psychology in the Schools, 8,* 373-378.

McLaughlin, B. (1984). *School-language acquisition in childhood: Vol. 1 Preschool Children.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

McPartland, J., McDill, E., Royster, D., Natmillo, G., & Pallas, A. (1988). A typology for dropout prevention. *CREMS Newsletter.* Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University.

Miller, J. A. (1990). E.D., in shift, to fund developmental bilingual programs. *Education Week,* p. 19.

Moll, L. C. (1992, March). Bilingual classroom studies and community analysis: Some recent trends. *Educational Researcher, 21*(2), 20-24.

Morley, J. (1987). Current directions in teaching English to speakers of other languages: A state-of-the-art synopsis. *TESOL Quarterly, 21*(2), 16-20.

Murray, H. B., Herling, G. B., & Staebler, B. K. (1973). The effects of locus of control and pattern of performance on teachers' evaluation of a student. *Psychology in the Schools, 10*(3), 345-350.

National Advisory and Coordinating Council on Bilingual Education (1988). *Twelfth annual report*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

National Council of La Raza (1992, January-March). Minorities making gains in higher education, not high school completion. *Education Network News, 11* (2).

Nicolau, S., & Ramos, C. L. (1990). *Together is better: Building strong relationships between schools and Hispanic parents*. New York: Hispanic Policy Development Project, Inc.

O'Connell, E. J., Dusek, J. B., & Wheeler, R. J. (1974). A follow-up study of teacher expectancy effects. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 66*(3), 325- 328.

Olsen, L. (1988). *Crossing the schoolhouse border: Immigrant students and California public schools*. Boston, MA: California Tomorrow.

Orfield, G., Monfort, F., & Aaron, M. (1989). *Segregation, integration and public policy: National, state, and metropolitan trends in public schools*. Washington, DC: National School Board Association Council of Urban Boards of Education.

Ortiz, A. A. (1986). Characteristics of limited-English proficient Hispanic students served in programs for the learning disabled. Implications for policy and practice (Part II). *Bilingual Special Education Newsletter*. Austin: The University of Texas at Austin.

Owen, E. H. (1991). *Trends in academic progress: Achievement of American students in science, 1970-90, mathematics, 1973-90, reading, 1971-90, and writing, 1984-90. Data Summary*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Oxford-Carpenter, R., Pol, L., Lopez, D., Strupp, P., Gendell, M., & Peng, S. (1984). *Demographic projections of non-English language*

*background and limited-English proficient persons in the United States to the year 2000 by state, age, and language group.* Rosslyn, VA: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Pallas, A. M. (1991). Who is at risk? Definition, demographics and decisions. In W. Schwartz and C. Howley (Eds.), *Overcoming risk: An annotated bibliography of publications developed by ERIC clearinghouses.* New York: ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education.

Peng, S. (1982). *Hispanic students in American high schools: Background characteristics and achievement* (National Center for Education Statistics Bulletin NCES 82-228b). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Pritchy-Smith, G. (1987). *The effects of competency testing on the supply of minority teachers: A report prepared for the National Education Association and the Council of Chief State School Officers.* Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Quality Education for Minorities Project. (1990). *Education that works: An action plan for the education of minorities.* Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Ramírez, J. D., Yuen, S. D., Ramey, D. R., & Pasta, D. J. (1990). *Final Report: Longitudinal study of immersion strategy, early-exit and late-exit transitional bilingual education programs for language-minority children* (2 vols.). San Mateo, CA: Aguirre International.

Rosser, P. (1987). *Sex bias in college admissions tests: Why women lose out.* Cambridge, MA: National Center for Fair and Open Testing.

Schmidt, P. (1992, June 17). Study finds LEP students denied remedial help. *Education Week,* p. 11.

Secada, W. G. (1991). Degree of bilingualism and arithmetic problem solving in Hispanic first graders. *Elementary School Journal, 92*(2), 213-231.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1980). *Language in the process of cultural assimilation and structural incorporation of linguistic minorities.* Rosslyn, VA: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

So, A. Y. (1987). High-achieving disadvantaged students: A study of low SES Hispanic language minority youth. *Urban Education,* 22(1), 19-35.

Sosa, A. S. (1988). *The impact of testing on hispanics*. Berkeley: University of California, Graduate School of Education, National Commission on Testing and Public Policy.

Steinberg, L., Blinde, P. L., & Chan, K. S. (1984). Dropping out among language minority youth. *Review of Educational Research, 54*(1), 113-132.

Strang, E. W., & Carlson, E. (1991). *Providing Chapter 1 services to limited English-proficient students* (Final Report to Office of Policy and Planning, U.S. Department of Education). Rockville, MD: Westat, Inc.

Texas Association for Bilingual Education. (1988). *Ever vigil por nuestros niños* (Vol. 2). Dallas, TX: Author.

Thonis, E. W. (1970). *Teaching reading to non-English speakers*. New York: Collier Macmillan International, Inc.

Tikunoff, W. (1983). Chapter four: Components of effective instruction for LEP students. In S. H. Fradd & W. J. Tikunoff (Eds.), *Bilingual education and bilingual special education: A guide for administrators*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown.

Tikunoff, W. (Ed.) (1983). *Teaching in successful bilingual instructional settings*. San Francisco, CA: Far West Laboratory.

Troike, R. C. (1978). Research evidence for the effectiveness of bilingual education. *NABE Journal, 3*(1), 13-24.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. (1988). *The Hispanic population in the United States* (Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 438). Washington, DC: Author.

U.S. Department of Education (1989). *Condition of education*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Valdivieso, R., & Davis, C. (1988). *U.S. Hispanics: Challenging issues for the 1990s* (Population Trends and Public Policy, No. 17). Washington, DC: Population Reference Bureau.

Varisco de García, N. (1990). *Hispanic women: Portraits of leadership*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of San Francisco, California.

Waggoner, D. (1988). *The undereducation of American youth*. San Antonio, TX: Intercultural Development Research Association.

Walshe, R. D. (Ed.) (1983). *Donald Graves in Australia—"Children want to write . . ."* Rozelle, New South Wales, Australia: Primary English Teaching Association Ltd.

Weinberg, M. (1977). *Minority students: A research appraisal*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.

Widdowson, H. G. (1978). *Teaching language as communication*. London, England: Oxford University Press.

Wong-Fillmore, L. (1982). Instructional language as linguistic input: Second language learning in classrooms. In L. C. Wilkinson (Ed.), *Communicating in the classroom*. New York: Academic Press.

Wong-Fillmore, L. (1991). Language and cultural issues in the early education of language minority children. In S. Kagan (Ed.), *The care and education of America's young children: Obstacles and opportunities* (90th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I, pp. 30-49). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Wong-Fillmore, L., Ammon, P., McLaughlin, B., & Ammon, A.S. (1985). *Final report for learning English through bilingual instruction*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.

Wong-Fillmore, L., & Valadez, C. (1986). Teaching bilingual learners. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Woodworth, W. P., & Salzer, R. T. (1971). Black children's speech and teachers' evaluations. *Urban Education, 6*, 167-173.

Yee, A. H. (1968). Interpersonal attitudes of teachers and advantaged and disadvantaged pupils. *Journal of Human Resources, 3*, 327-345.

## About the Author

Dr. Alicia Salinas Sosa is an educator with 23 years of experience in bilingual education. She has been employed with Intercultural Development Research Association (IDRA) since 1975.

In 1986 she became the coordinator of the Valued Youth Partnership Program, a nationally recognized dropout prevention program. This program was named one of America's Ten Best Educational Programs, and was featured in Tom Brockaw's, *American Agenda, The New York Times*, and *U.S. News and World Today*. Since then, the program has been greatly disseminated and honored.

In the past five years, Alicia has directed a Pre-K Support Program serving four school districts and headed the Center for Test Equity. She coordinated a national hearing on the impact of Testing on Hispanics. The proceedings are being disseminated through the ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education.

Currently, Dr. Sosa serves as Director of the Desegregation Assistance Center that serves public schools in a five state area: Texas, Louisiana, Arkansas, Oklahoma, and New Mexico. She also oversees two other projects—one is an induction program for beginning bilingual teachers and the other is the MIJA program, a math enrichment program for Hispanic girls.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ISBN 1-880785-10-2